DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 788 HE 031 037

TITLE	Annual Student Remediation Report, 1996-97.
INSTITUTION	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City.
PUB DATE	1998-02-06
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *College Freshmen; College Outcomes Assessment; College Students; Core Curriculum; *Developmental Studies Programs; Enrollment Rate; High Schools; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Language Arts; Program Effectiveness; Remedial Instruction; Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; Secondary School Curriculum; *State Standards; State Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	American College Testing Program; *Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

This report details enrollment and achievement in remedial courses in Oklahoma's higher education institutions for the 1996-97 academic year. An introductory section gives background information on state standards for student assessment and placement requirements, with reference to some regional and national studies on remediation. Subsequent sections outline the methodology, findings, and conclusions of the survey. Data tables are included. Data is included for: remedial instruction enrollments for different institution types (comprehensive universities, regional universities, community colleges), proportion of freshmen enrolling at each institution type, fall semester enrollment rates, enrollment rates for students meeting the state's 11-unit high school core curriculum requirements, enrollment by remedial course type (mathematics, English, science, reading), relationship of enrollment to American College Testing Program scores, and enrollment of freshmen direct from high school. The state's "Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability" is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 416 788

Oklahoma State System
Of
Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT

February 6, 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Robert L. McCormick
Chairman
Stillwater

John Massey
Vice Chairman, Durant

Stephen J. Jatras
Tulsa

Bill Burgess, Jr.
Secretary, Lawton

Frederick W. McCann
Oklahoma City

Leonard J. Eaton, Jr.
Assistant Secretary, Tulsa

Joe L. Mayer
Guymon

Marlin "Ike" Glass
Newkirk

Carl R. Renfro
Ponca City

Hans Brisch
Chancellor

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in compliance with Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11246 as amended, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and other federal laws do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, handicap, or status as a veteran in any of its policies, practices, or procedures. This includes but is not limited to admissions, employment, financial aid, and educational services.

This publication, duplicated by the State Regents' central services, is issued by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as authorized by 70 O.S. 1991, Section 3206. Copies have been prepared and distributed internally. Copies have been deposited with the Publications Clearinghouse of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT

Executive Summary i

Background 1

Methodology 2

Findings 2

Conclusions 4

Tables 6

Appendix

Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability 10

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT
1996-97

Executive Summary

BACKGROUND:

- In 1991, the State Regents adopted the Student Assessment Policy that required each institution to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment program with mandatory student placement in fall 1994. This is the sixth annual student remediation report.

- In 1993, the policy was modified requiring institutions to use a score of 19 on the ACT subject areas of English, mathematics, science reasoning, and reading as the "first cut" in determining the need for remediation.

- Students with an ACT subject score below 19 must either enroll in a remedial course or undergo secondary institutional assessment. Students scoring below the designated levels on these secondary tests must successfully complete appropriate remedial courses.

- Oklahoma's remediation rates are comparable to regional and national remedial data.

FINDINGS:

- During the 1996-97 academic year, 37,472 students enrolled in remedial courses: 2,748 (7 percent) at the comprehensive universities, 6,011 (16 percent) at the regional universities, and 28,713 (77 percent) at the two-year colleges.

- Of the 25,450 fall 1996 first-time freshmen, 10,251 (40 percent) enrolled in remedial courses sometime during the 1996-97 academic year: 1,041 (21 percent) of the comprehensive university freshmen, 2,205 (34 percent) of the regional university freshmen, and 7,005 (50 percent) of the two-year college freshmen.

- Comparing fall semester remedial course enrollments, the percent of first-time freshmen taking remediation during their first semester decreased from 40 percent in fall 1995 to 35 percent in fall 1996.

- Fall 1996 first-time freshmen who met the State Regents' 11-unit high school core curriculum enrolled in remedial courses at lower rates than those students who did not meet the core curriculum (38 and 58 percent, respectively).

- Of the fall 1996 first-time freshmen, 34 percent enrolled in at least one remedial mathematics course, 13 percent in a remedial English course, 4 percent in a remedial science course, and 4 percent in a remedial reading course sometime during the 1996-97 academic year.

- The percentage of first-time freshmen with an ACT subject score below 19 continued to decrease since fall 1994. For ACT English scores, the percent of freshmen with a score below 19 decreased from 32 percent in 1994 to 27 percent in 1995 to 22 percent in 1996. In mathematics, the decrease was 39 percent to 34 percent to 27 percent. In science, the decrease was 25 percent to 21 percent to 17 percent. And in reading, the decrease was 27 percent to 21 percent to 19 percent.

- The percentage of direct from high school freshmen enrolling in remedial courses decreased from 42 percent in fall 1994 to 38 percent in fall 1995 to 34 percent in fall 1996. Also, this is lower than the 35 percent of all first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses in fall 1996.

CONCLUSIONS:

- The State Regents' multiple initiatives to enhance student preparation for college continue to payoff. Improved high school preparation is decreasing student enrollment in remedial courses in college. The percent of direct from high school freshmen who take remedial courses declined for the second consecutive year. Also during the past two years, the number of students with ACT subject scores below 19 decreased.

- The 1997 SREB study concluded that the following actions improve student preparation and reduce remediation: examine rigor and content of college preparatory programs, establish performance standards, develop information on remediation, provide feedback to high schools, bring college and school faculties together, offer scholarships for taking a challenging curriculum, and improve quality of teaching. The State Regents have adopted and implemented actions consistent with SREB recommendations including improvements in teacher preparation.

- Students who take the State Regents' high school core curriculum were less likely to enroll in remedial courses. The amount of remediation should continue to decline with the increase of the core requirement from 11 to 15 courses beginning fall 1997. Also, the State Regents continue to expand the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program (OHLAP) which offers low-income students scholarships if they complete a 17-unit high school core curriculum.

- Other initiatives to strengthen high school preparation include (1) a feedback report to high schools by type of remediation taken by their students and (2) the Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) which is funded by the State Regents. This ACT program provides students and schools feedback at the 8th and 10th grades and is linked to the ACT test. This early alert provides high school students the opportunities to take additional college preparation courses.

- The State Board of Education announced plans to implement an ACT Incentive Program to provide financial incentives to high schools for students who complete the ACT Core Curriculum and score at the State Regents' required levels of 19 on the subject tests. Recognizing that its implementation will further enhance student

preparation for college and reduce remediation, the State Regents endorsed this program at their December 12 meeting.

- In Oklahoma and nationally, more remediation is required in mathematics than other subjects. To address this issue, the State Regents launched a Mathematics Preparation Initiative which is a five-year project dedicated to systematic change. The advisory committee includes mathematics faculty from schools and colleges.

- Two-year colleges continue to be the primary source of remediation (77 percent) in the State System. This is consistent with the community college's mission and the State Regents' stated goal to focus remediation at the two-year college level and reduce remediation at the comprehensive and regional universities.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT
1996-97

BACKGROUND:

In 1991, the State Regents adopted the *Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability* (II-2-117) that requires State System institutions to develop and implement comprehensive assessment programs (see Appendix). By design, these assessment programs were created and implemented over a two-year period and made operational by spring 1993 with mandatory student placement in fall 1994. Using the student assessment results, institutions continue to evaluate and modify their assessment programs. This is the sixth annual student remediation report; it describes remedial activity during the 1996-97 academic year and provides comparisons to previous years.

In 1993, the policy was modified requiring institutions to use a score of 19 on the ACT subject areas of English, mathematics, science reasoning, and reading as the "first cut" in determining the need for remediation. Students with an ACT subject score below 19 must either enroll in a remedial course or undergo secondary assessment as described in the institution's approved assessment plan to determine whether remediation is needed. Students scoring below the designated levels on these secondary tests must successfully complete appropriate remedial courses. Several institutions have also established higher standards by requiring additional testing of those students meeting or exceeding the minimum ACT subject test score. Some students choose to take remedial courses as voluntary review for more difficult college courses.

Two studies by the Southern Regional Education Board[1,2] (SREB) and two National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) studies[3,4] reported that approximately one-third of new freshmen enrolled in remedial courses. However, the SREB studies found that states with mandatory assessment and placement programs reported higher percentages of students enrolled in remedial courses. Only about one-third of the regional states and one-half of the institutions nationally that offer remediation make it mandatory. Also, these studies did not include science remediation as the Oklahoma report does. Therefore, the slightly higher percent of State System students enrolling in remedial courses since the State Regents' policy made remediation mandatory in 1994 is consistent with these reports. Also

---

[1] "They Came to College?: A Remedial Developmental Profile of First-Time Freshmen in SREB States," Southern Regional Education Board, 1991.

[2] "Better Preparation, Less Remediation: Challenging Courses Make a Difference," State Regional Education Board, 1997.

[3] "College-Level Remedial Education in the Fall of 1989," National Center for Education Statistics, May 1991.

[4] "Remedial Education at Higher Education Institutions in Fall 1995," National Center for Education Statistics, October 1996.

consistent with the 1997 SREB report, students enrolling in college directly from high school are less likely to need remediation than adult students.

The 1996 NCES study reported that 47 percent of institutions experienced no change in the number of students in remediation in the past five years and 39 percent had an increase. As in Oklahoma, most of the remediation was in mathematics. The 1991 NCES study reported a lack of meaningful feedback from colleges to high schools regarding the academic preparation of their students. In Oklahoma, steps have been taken to facilitate greater feedback through cooperation with the Office of Accountability's Educational Indicators Program, the State Regents' High School Indicator Report to which remediation has been added, and the development of a new comprehensive plan to help improve high school student preparation for college.

METHODOLOGY:

In 1991, the State Regents began to collect remediation data from institutions via annual manual "paper and pencil" surveys. For 1996-97, data collection was automated to reduce the staff hours needed to complete the surveys and to improve the reporting and tracking of remediation data. Most of the remediation data for this report were collected from the Unitized Data System (UDS). Institutions separately provided information about secondary assessment for placement in college-level courses, because this information is not available in the UDS.

Fall comparisons are incomplete, because remediation activity occurs throughout the academic year; however, only fall data were collected for previous annual reports. Future reports will compare full-year remediation activity.

FINDINGS:

Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses

- During the 1996-97 academic year, 37,472 students enrolled in remedial courses: 2,748 (7 percent) at the comprehensive universities, 6,011 (16 percent) at the regional universities, and 28,713 (77 percent) at the two-year colleges (Table 1).

- Half of the students enrolled in remedial courses in the fall, 41 percent in the spring, and 9 percent in the summer.

- These students generated 49,338 remedial enrollments: 2,951 (6 percent) at the comprehensive universities, 7,785 (16 percent) at the regional universities, and 38,602 (78 percent) at the two-year colleges.

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses

- Of the 25,450 fall 1996 freshmen, 10,251 (40 percent) enrolled in remedial courses sometime during the 1996-97 academic year: 1,041 (21 percent) of the comprehensive university freshmen, 2,205 (34 percent) of the regional university freshmen, and 7,005 (50 percent) of the two-year college freshmen.

- From fall 1995 to fall 1996, the percentage of first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses decreased from 40 to 35 percent for the State System, from 23 to 19 percent at the comprehensive universities, from 38 to 31 percent at the regional universities and from 46 to 43 percent at the two-year colleges (Table 3).

Remediation and High School Core Curriculum

When taking the ACT, students are asked to respond to a series of questions pertaining to their high school curriculum. This information was combined with UDS data on remedial courses to determine whether completing the State Regents' 11-unit high school core curriculum affects remedial enrollments. ACT data were not available for out-of-state applicants or for most special non-degree seeking adult admission, or international students.

- A smaller percentage of fall 1996 first-time freshmen who met the high school core curriculum (38 percent) enrolled in remedial courses than freshmen who did not meet the core curriculum (58 percent) or those with no information (47 percent) (Table 4).

- At the comprehensive universities, 21 percent of those students who met the core curriculum enrolled in remediation compared to 28 percent of those who did not meet the core. At the regional universities and two-year colleges, the comparisons are 38 and 50 percent respectively who met the core curriculum compared to 57 and 66 percent who did not.

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area

- Of the fall 1996 first-time freshmen, 34 percent enrolled in at least one remedial mathematics course, 13 percent in a remedial English course, 4 percent in a remedial science course, and 4 percent in a remedial reading course sometime during the 1996-97 academic year (Table 5). At the comprehensive universities, 19 percent enrolled in a remedial mathematics course, 3 percent in a remedial English course, 1 percent in a remedial science course, and 0 percent in a remedial reading course. At the regional universities, 27 percent enrolled in a remedial mathematics course, 16 percent in a remedial English course, 5 percent in a remedial science course, and 8 percent in a remedial reading course. At the two-year colleges, 42 percent enrolled in a remedial mathematics course, 16 percent in a remedial English course, 4 percent in a remedial science course, and 4 percent in a remedial reading course.

- The percentages of first-time freshmen with an ACT subject score below 19 continued to decrease since fall 1994 (Table 6). For ACT English scores, the percent of freshmen with a score below 19 decreased from 32 percent in 1994 to 27 percent in 1995 to 22 percent in 1996. In mathematics, the decrease was 39 percent to 34 percent to 27 percent. In science, the decrease was 25 percent to 21 percent to 17 percent. And in reading, the decrease was 27 percent to 21 percent to 19 percent.

- From fall 1994 to fall 1996, the percentage of English scores below 19 remained stable at 12 percent at the comprehensive universities, decreased from 41 to 26 percent at the regional universities, and decreased from 35 to 24 percent at the two-year colleges.

- From fall 1994 to fall 1996, mathematics scores below 19 decreased from 18 percent to 14 percent at the comprehensive universities, decreased from 53 to 33 percent at the regional universities, and decreased from 41 to 28 percent at the two-year colleges.

- From fall 1994 to fall 1996, science scores below 19 decreased from 10 percent to 7 percent at the comprehensive universities, decreased from 28 to 20 percent at the regional universities, and decreased from 27 to 20 percent at the two-year colleges.

- From fall 1994 to fall 1996, reading scores below 19 decreased from 10 percent to 9 percent at the comprehensive universities, decreased from 33 to 21 percent at the regional universities, and decreased from 29 to 21 percent at the two-year colleges.

- From fall 1995 to fall 1996, the percentages of students passing secondary testing decreased for English, mathematics, and reading, but increased for science. In fall 1996, the largest number of ACT scores below 19 in any subject area was in mathematics (6,787), followed by English (5,710), reading (4,731), and science (4,414). Of those scoring below 19 on the ACT, the following percentage of students passed secondary testing: 16 percent in mathematics, 32 percent in English, 32 percent in reading, and 15 percent in science.

First-Time Freshmen Direct from High School

- In fall 1996, 34 percentage of the first-time freshmen who entered college directly from high school enrolled in remedial courses: 18 percent at the comprehensive universities, 30 percent at the regional universities, and 47 percent at the two-year colleges (Table 7).

- The percentage of direct from high school freshmen enrolling in remediation decreased from 42 percent in fall 1994 to 38 percent in fall 1995 to 34 percent in fall 1996. Also, this is lower than the 35 percent of *all* first-time freshmen enrolled in remediation in fall 1996.

CONCLUSIONS:

- The State Regents' multiple initiatives to enhance student preparation for college continue to payoff. Improved high school preparation is decreasing student enrollment in remedial courses in college. The percent of direct from high school freshmen who take remedial courses declined for the second consecutive year. Also during the past two years, the number of students with ACT subject scores below 19 decreased.

- The 1997 SREB study concluded that the following actions improve student preparation and reduce remediation: examine rigor and content of college preparatory programs, establish performance standards, develop information on remediation, provide feedback to high schools, bring college and school faculties together, offer scholarships for taking a challenging curriculum, and improve quality of teaching. The State Regents have adopted and implemented actions consistent with SREB recommendations including improvements in teacher preparation.

- Students who take the State Regents' high school core curriculum were less likely to enroll in remedial courses. The amount of remediation should continue to decline with

the increase of the core requirement from 11 to 15 courses beginning fall 1997. Also, the State Regents continue to expand the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program (OHLAP) which offers low-income students scholarships if they complete a 17-unit high school core curriculum.

- Other initiatives to strengthen high school preparation include (1) a feedback report to high schools by type of remediation taken by their students and (2) the Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) which is funded by the State Regents. This ACT program provides students and schools feedback at the 8th and 10th grades and is linked to the ACT test. This early alert provides high school students the opportunities to take additional college preparation courses.

- The State Board of Education announced plans to implement an ACT Incentive Program to provide financial incentives to high schools for students who complete the ACT Core Curriculum and score at the State Regents' required levels of 19 on the subject tests. Recognizing that its implementation will further enhance student preparation for college and reduce remediation, the State Regents endorsed this program at their December 12 meeting.

- In Oklahoma and nationally, more remediation is required in mathematics than other subjects. To address this issue, the State Regents have launched a Mathematics Preparation Initiative which is a five-year project dedicated to systematic change. The advisory committee included mathematics faculty from school and colleges.

- Two-year colleges continue to be the primary source of remediation (77 percent) in the State System. This is consistent with the community college's mission and the State Regents' stated goal to focus remediation at the two-year college level and reduce remediation at the comprehensive and regional universities.

Annual Student Remediation Report

Tables

February 6, 1998

Table 1
Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses
1996-97

Tier	Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses					Number of Enrollments in Remedial Courses				
	Summer 1996	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Total	Percent of Total	Summer 1996	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Total	Percent of Total
Comprehensive	164	1,669	915	2,748	7%	164	1,856	931	2,951	6%
Regional	438	3,365	2,208	6,011	16%	496	4,603	2,686	7,785	16%
Two-Year	2,847	13,602	12,264	28,713	77%	3,524	18,449	16,629	38,602	78%
State System	3,449	18,636	15,387	37,472	100%	4,184	24,908	20,246	49,338	100%
Percent of State System	9%	50%	41%	100%		8%	50%	41%	100%	

Table 2
First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses
1996-97

Tier	Number of Fall 1996 First-Time Freshmen	Number Enrolled in Remedial Courses				Percent Enrolled in Remedial Courses			
		Sum 95	Fall 96	Spr 97	Total*	Sum 95	Fall 96	Spr 97	Total
Comprehensive	4,898	18	930	374	1,041	<1%	19%	8%	21%
Regional	6,488	73	2,040	878	2,205	1%	31%	14%	34%
Two-Year	14,064	515	6,005	3,272	7,005	4%	43%	23%	50%
State System	25,450	606	8,975	4,524	10,251	2%	35%	18%	40%

* Unduplicated annual headcount reported, i.e., students are counted only once regardless of the number of times they enroll in remedial courses.

Table 3
Five-Year History of First-Time Freshman Enrollments in Remedial Courses
Fall 1992 to Fall 1996

Tier	Number of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses					Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	Fall 92	Fall 93	Fall 94*	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 92	Fall 93	Fall 94*	Fall 95	Fall 96
Comprehensive	1,101	1,070	1,243	1,242	930	24%	24%	27%	23%	19%
Regional	1,506	1,681	2,146	2,353	2,040	22%	26%	38%	38%	31%
Two-Year	6,297	5,128	6,717	7,609	6,005	44%	36%	38%	46%	43%
State System	8,904	7,879	10,106	11,204	8,975	34%	31%	36%	40%	35%

* Remedial course placement became mandatory.

Table 4
Remediation and High School Core Curriculum
1996-97

Tier	Number of Fall 1996 First-Time Freshmen and Status of 11-Unit High School Core			Number Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Status of 11-Unit High School Core			Percent Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Status of 11-Unit High School Core		
	Did Not Meet	Met	No Info.*	Did Not Meet	Met	No Info*	Did Not Meet	Met	No Info.*
Comprehensive	39	3,407	1,452	11	722	308	28%	21%	21%
Regional	60	3,104	1,929	34	1,174	997	57%	38%	52%
Two-Year	160	5,408	8,496	105	2,677	4,223	66%	50%	50%
State System	259	11,919	11,877	150	4,573	5,528	58%	38%	47%

* Data not provided for out-of-state and most special non-degree seeking, adult admission, or international students.

Table 5
Number and Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area
1996-97

Tier	Number of Fall 1996 First-Time Freshmen	Freshmen* Enrolled in Remediation by Subject Area				Percent Enrolled in Remediation by Subject Area			
		English	Math	Science	Reading**	English	Math	Science	Reading
Comprehensive	4,898	171	939	64	0	3%	19%	1%	0%
Regional	6,488	1,022	1,720	347	494	16%	27%	5%	8%
Two-Year	14,064	2,224	5,935	579	536	16%	42%	4%	4%
State System	25,450	3,417	8,594	990	1,030	13%	34%	4%	4%

* Unduplicated annual headcount within each subject because some students enrolled in the same remedial course more than once or more than one remedial course per subject area.

** Some reading remediation is reported as English remediation.

Table 6
First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT Subject Tests and Passing Secondary Tests
Fall 1995 to Fall 1996

English*

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT			Number of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests		Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests	
	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996
Comprehensive	12%	14%	12%	272	203	37%	36%
Regional	41%	35%	26%	808	459	37%	27%
Two-Year	35%	29%	24%	2,105	1,140	45%	33%
State System	32%	27%	22%	3,185	1,802	42%	32%

Mathematics

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT			Number of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests		Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests	
	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996
Comprehensive	18%	18%	14%	280	142	29%	21%
Regional	53%	48%	33%	933	485	31%	22%
Two-Year	41%	33%	28%	1,143	492	21%	12%
State System	39%	34%	27%	2,356	1,119	25%	16%

Science

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT			Number of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests		Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests	
	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996
Comprehensive	10%	10%	7%	167	101	32%	28%
Regional	28%	30%	20%	181	213	10%	16%
Two-Year	27%	22%	20%	452	346	12%	13%
State System	25%	21%	17%	800	660	13%	15%

Reading*

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT			Number of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests		Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests	
	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1995	Fall 1996
Comprehensive	10%	10%	9%	211	223	39%	49%
Regional	33%	27%	21%	442	326	26%	24%
Two-Year	29%	22%	21%	1,573	955	44%	33%
State System	27%	21%	19%	2,226	1,504	38%	32%

* Some reading remediation is reported as English remediation.

Table 7
Five-Year History of Student Enrollments in Remedial Courses by Type of Admission
Fall 1992 to Fall 1996

First-Time Freshmen Direct from High School

Tier	Number of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses					Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	Fall 92	Fall 93	Fall 94*	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 92	Fall 93	Fall 94*	Fall 95	Fall 96
Comprehensive	989	896	712	1,151	822	23%	23%	32%	23%	18%
Regional	854	803	2,279	1,861	1,491	18%	18%	49%	36%	30%
Two-Year	2,472	2,231	2,864	4,647	3,250	41%	35%	40%	47%	47%
State System	4,315	3,930	5,855	7,659	5,563	29%	27%	42%	38%	34%

* Remedial course placement became mandatory.

Annual Student Remediation Report

Appendix

February 6, 1998

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS FOR PURPOSES OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT AND STATE SYSTEM ACCOUNTABILITY

The Constitution of Oklahoma charges the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education with responsibility for prescribing standards for admission, retention, and graduation applicable to each institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. The State Regents also have the responsibility to provide leadership in the coordination of the orderly transfer of students between and among institutions of the State System. Inherent in such responsibilities is the prescribing of mechanisms to monitor and facilitate the assessment of students for purposes of instructional improvement and State System accountability.

Statement of Accountability:

Accountability to the citizens of Oklahoma within a tax-supported educational system is of paramount importance. The public has both the need and right to know that their tax dollars are being used wisely, and most importantly, producing tangible, measurable outcomes of learning for individual students enrolled within the State System. Improvement in student learning and on-going faculty development, measurable through assessment programs, are achievable and essential outcomes, and the responsibility of the State System to the public.

Definition and Purpose:

Assess: The original definition of *assess* was *to sit down beside.* The term has evolved to mean careful evaluation based on the kind of close observation that comes from *sitting down beside.*[1] Such a definition captures the desired relationship between teacher and student and the spirit of the following policy statement.

For purposes of this policy, student assessment in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is defined as *a multi-dimensional evaluative process that measures the overall educational impact of the college/university experience on students and provides information for making program improvements.*

Assessment is not an end in and of itself. Similarly, to document performance is not necessarily to improve performance. Thus the purpose of assessment is to maximize student success through the assessment process by the systematic gathering, interpretation, and use of information about student learning/achievement to improve instruction. The results of assessment contribute to and are an integral part of the institution's strategic planning and program review process to improve teaching and learning. As previously noted, it also is one mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of the State's System of Higher Education. Finally, student assessment is designed to contribute to assuring the integrity of college degrees, and other educational activities/goals, to increasing the retention and graduate rates of college students, to enhancing the quality of campus life in general, and to encouraging high school students to improve their academic preparation for college.

---

[1] ***Assessment at Alverno College*** **by the Alverno College Faculty, page 1.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Institutional Requirements

Each college and university shall assess individual student performance in achieving its programmatic objectives. Specifically, each institution will develop criteria, subject to State Regents' approval, for the evaluation of students at college entry to determine academic preparation and course placement; mid-level assessment to determine basic skill competencies; exit assessment to evaluate the outcomes in the student's major; and student perception of program quality including satisfaction with support services, academic curriculum, and the faculty. Such evaluation criteria must be tied to stated program outcomes and learner competencies.

In recognition of varying institutional missions and clientele served, such assessment components will be campus based under the leadership of the local faculty and administrators providing that the procedures meet the requirements detailed in the following sections. Assessment programs should consider the needs of special populations in the development of policies and procedures. Finally, as institutions develop criteria and select assessment mechanisms, each program component should be coordinated and complement the whole.

Entry Level Assessment and Placement

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist institutional faculties and counselors in making decisions that will give students the best possible chance of success in attaining their academic goals. Each institution will use an established ACT score in the four subject areas of science reasoning, mathematics, reading, and English as the "first cut" in determining individual student readiness for college level course work.[2] Should a student score below the level, s/he will be required to remediate in the discipline area or, consistent with institution's approved assessment plan, undergo additional testing to determine his/her level of readiness for college level work. Similarly, institutions may, within their approved assessment plans, establish higher standards by requiring additional testing of those students meeting or exceeding the minimum ACT subject test score requirement. These subject test score requirements will be communicated to college bound students, parents, and common schools for the purpose of informing them of the levels of proficiency in the basic skills areas needed to be adequately prepared for college level work. Additionally, these ACT subscores provide a standard yardstick for measuring student readiness across the State System.

For high school students wishing to enroll concurrently in college courses the established ACT score[2] in the four subject areas will apply as follows: A high school student not meeting the designated score in science reasoning, mathematics, and English will not be permitted enrollment in the corresponding college subject area. A student scoring below the established ACT score in reading will not be permitted enrollment in any other collegiate course (outside the subjects of science, mathematics, and English).

Institutional entry level assessment programs should include an evaluation of past academic performance, educational readiness (such as mental, physical, and

---

[2] The appropriate subtest level for each subject area (one system score for each subject area) will be set by the State Regents following staff work with ACT staff and the Council on Instruction. Implementation of this requirement will be fall 1994. Students admitted under the Special Adult Admission provision may be exempt from this requirement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

emotional), educational goals, study skills, values, self-concept and motivation. Student assessment results will be utilized in the placement and advisement process to ensure that students enroll in courses appropriate for their skill levels. Tracking systems should be implemented to ensure that information from assessment and completion of course work is used to evaluate and strengthen programs in order to further enhance student achievement and development. The data collection activities should be clearly linked to instructional improvement efforts.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents in the following format:

1. the number of students participating in entry-level assessment and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. the number of students requiring additional basic skills development by area;
3. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
4. the methodologies (courses, tutoring, etc.) by which students were required to participate in the improvement of basic skills.

The tracking of these students in future semesters is expected.

Mid-Level Assessment

Generally, mid-level assessment competencies are gained through the student's general education program. Thus, the results of mid-level assessment should be used to improve the institution's program of general education. Assessment at mid-level is designed to assess the student's academic progress and learning competencies in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking.

Mid-level assessments will normally occur after the student has completed forty-five semester hours and prior to the completion of seventy semester hours for students in baccalaureate programs. For associate degree programs assessments may occur at mid-level or at the end of the degree program.

Examples of appropriate measures include academic standing, GPA, standardized and institutionally developed instruments, portfolios, etc.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents as follows:

1. the number of students assessed and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
3. detailed plans for any instructional changes due to the assessment results.

The tracking of these students in future semesters is expected.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program Outcomes Assessment

Program Outcomes Assessment, or major field of study assessment, is the third component of the State Regents' policy. Such assessments should be designed to measure how well students are meeting institutionally stated program goals and objectives.

As with other levels of assessment, selection of the assessment instruments and other parameters (such as target groups, when testing occurs, etc.) is the responsibility of the institution subject to State Regents' approval as previously specified. Preference should be given to nationally standardized instruments. The following criteria are guidelines for the section of assessment methodologies:

a) Instrument(s) should reflect the curriculum for the major and measure skills and abilities identified in the program goals and objectives;
b) Instrument(s) should assess higher level thinking skills in applying learned information; and
c) Instrument(s) should be demonstrated to be reliable and valid.

Nationally normed instruments required for graduate or professional study, or those that serve as prerequisites to practice in the profession, may be included as appropriate assessment devices. Examples are the GRE (Graduate Record Exam), NTE (National Teacher Exam), and various licensing examinations.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents as follows:

1. the number of students assessed and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
3. detailed plans for any instructional changes due to the assessment results.

Assessment of Student Satisfaction

Perceptions of students and alumni are important in the evaluation of and the enhancement of academic and campus programs and services. Such perceptions are valuable because they provide an indication of the students' subjective view of events and services which collectively constitute their undergraduate experiences. Evaluations of student satisfaction can be accomplished via surveys, interviews, etc. Resulting data are to be used to provide feedback for the improvement of programs and services.

Examples of programs/activities to be included in this level of assessment are satisfaction with student services, quality of food services, access to financial aid, residence hall facilities, day care, parking, etc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents as follows:

1. the number of students assessed and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
3. detailed plans for any instructional changes due to the assessment results.

Graduate Student Assessment:

Higher education institutions that charge their graduate students the student assessment fee must perform assessment beyond the standard requirements for admission to and graduation from a graduate program. An institution that charges the assessment fee will include a description of graduate student assessment and assessment fee usage in its institutional assessment plan. Graduate student assessment results will be included in the institution's annual assessment report to the State Regents. In addition to the annual reporting requirements described above, graduate programs should attempt to present instrument data that compare graduate student performance with statewide or national norms.

The institution's plan for graduate student assessment will explain each graduate program's assessment process, including stages of assessment, descriptions of instruments used, methods of data collection, the relationship of data analysis to program improvement, and the administrative organization used to develop and review the assessment plan. Emphasis should be placed on assessing student learning and evaluating student satisfaction with instruction and services. The institution will adopt or develop assessment instruments that augment pre-assessment fee instruments (i.e. grade transcripts, Graduate Record Exams, course grades, and comprehensive exams). Departmental pre-tests, capstone experiences, cohort tracking, portfolios, interviews, and postgraduate surveys are some commonly used assessment methods.

Adopted October 4, 1991. Revised April 15, 1994, and June 28, 1996.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE